

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the remarks and analysis contained in the Office Action. Amendments to the claims are presented above. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 can be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 11-16 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the *Masahiro* reference can be withdrawn. There is no *prima facie* case of anticipation. The *Masahiro* reference does not provide any tactile feedback based upon a determination whether an elevator system can respond to a desired call. Instead, that reference involves detecting whether a surface associated with a call device has been contacted and then vibrating a call button before the button is touched. Once the button has been touched by a passenger, the vibration stops. That is not tactile feedback that a desired call will be responded to by the elevator system. Instead, the *Masahiro* reference provides a vibration of a call button to enable an individual to locate that button. Given that the vibration stops upon the call button being touched, there is no tactile feedback indicating whether or not the elevator system will respond to the desired call. Therefore, none of the claims are anticipated.

The rejection of claims 3-9, 17, 18, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103 can be withdraw.

As indicated above, the *Masahiro* reference does not provide tactile feedback indicating whether an elevator system will respond to a desired call. Adding the teachings of the *Jiyunji* reference to the *Masahiro* reference does not provide such an arrangement. The *Jiyunji* reference

teaches vibrating a Braille plate that is near a call button upon an elevator arriving at that location so that an individual knows to board that elevator car (or to exit the car at that time if the Braille plate is provided inside of the elevator car). It follows that even if the combination could be made, the result would not be consistent with Applicant's claimed invention. At best, the combination would be a call button that vibrates before it is touched and a Braille plate near the call button that vibrates upon elevator car arrival. That is not the same thing as the arrangement recited in Applicant's claims. There is no *prima facie* case of obviousness.

**The rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103
should be withdrawn.**

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 10 based upon the proposed combination of the *Masahiro* and *Juntunen* references. The *Masahiro* reference has already been explained above. There is nothing in that reference or the *Juntunen* reference that teaches a response that provides tactile confirmation that an elevator system can respond to a desired call based on a signal from a controller that determines whether the elevator system can respond to the desired call. Therefore, even if the combination of the *Masahiro* and *Juntunen* references were made, there still is no *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that this case is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes that no additional fees are necessary, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1482 in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds for any additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS

By: 

David J. Gaskey, Reg. No. 37,139
400 W. Maple Rd., Ste. 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: March 3, 2009

N:\Clients\OTIS ELEVATOR\IP00237\PATENT\Response 2-09.doc